

Remarks

Reexamination and reconsideration of this application, as amended, is requested. Claims 1 and 3 – 20 remain in the application and no new claims have been added. Claim 2 has been canceled.

Applicant believes there is no charge for this response because no new claims have been added.

35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection

Claims 14 – 20 were rejected under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claims 14, 16 and 17 to delete all instances of “first type” or “type”. Applicant thus submits this rejection has been traversed.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection

Claims 1 – 3, 7 – 8, 14 and 16 – 20 were rejected as being anticipated by Kalavade et al. Claim 1 has been amended as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A system for providing accounting for a wireless network, the system including:

an access point connectable to a mobile client;

a wireless integrated node connected to the access point and configured for providing and mapping between two different communication protocols, wherein said wireless integrated node is capable of generating a call detail record in response to a trigger for use with the second communication protocol; and

a link for connecting the wireless integrated node to a charging gateway and further to an accounting system, wherein the accounting system provides a bill for usage of the wireless network by the mobile client;

wherein the first communication protocol is of a format required by the wireless network and the second communication protocol is of a format required by the accounting system.

Applicant has included "wherein said wireless integrated node is capable of generating a call detail record in response to a trigger for use with the second communication protocol" and agrees with Examiner that Kalavade et al does not include this element.

Thus, Applicant submits that with this amended the 102(e) rejection as it relates to claim 1 has been traversed.

Amended claim 7, now provides:

7. (Currently Amended) A method for generating call detail records in a format used with a mobile network for a client having an account with the mobile network and using a wireless local area network, the method comprising:

- receiving a RADIUS start message from an access point;
- generating a first Call Detail Record (CDR), in response to a trigger, from accounting information contained in the RADIUS start message; and
- sending the first CDR message to a charging gateway associated with the mobile network.

Applicant has included in response to a trigger and agrees with Examiner that Kalavade et al does not include this element.

Thus, Applicant submits that the 102(e) rejection as it relates to claim 7 has been traversed.

Amended claim 14, now provides:

14. (Currently Amended) An authentication server comprising:

- a first link connected to an authenticator associated with a Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN);

a second link connected to a gateway associated with a mobile network; and

a mapping system including instructions for receiving one or more first messages from the authenticator, the first messages ~~being of a first type~~ associated with the WLAN but not the mobile network; generating a first group of one or more call detail records from the received first messages in response to a trigger, the call detail records ~~being of a second type~~ associated with the mobile network; and sending the first group of call detail records to the gateway.

Applicant has included in claim 14, "in response to a trigger" and agrees with Examiner that Kalavade et al does not include this element.

Thus, Applicant submits that the 102(e) rejection as it relates to claim 14 has been traversed.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection

Applicant has amended claims 1, 7 and 14 to include the element of claim 4 which provided the trigger as set forth above. The 8-12-2005 office action rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) stating that although Kalavade did not disclose the generation means being "triggered", it was obvious to combine Madour which did disclose the generation means being triggered by receiving a

RADIUS Accounting Status message. However, Applicant respectfully submits that it would be improper to combine Kalavade et al with Madour.

Firstly, Applicant suggests there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the two and, indeed, the present invention and Kalavade et al. relate to inherently post paid accounting systems and the intricacies and nuances therein and Madour relates to prepaid. Said another way, the present invention generates a bill after use as provided in paragraph one, page three of the present invention. This system is thus far more complicated and intricate as provided by the pages of detail illustrating the nuances of the present invention in a post paid environment.

Further, Madour provides the sending of a RADIUS Accounting Start message comprises the correlation identifier and the prepaid capability and may allocate, for example, a first Volume Quota and choose a Volume quota Threshold (VT). This illustrates the different events that are "triggered" and the differences between bill systems and prepaid volume use systems and the non-obvious nature of combining these two distinct systems.

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that rejections of claims 1, 7 and 14 and claims that depend therefrom have been traversed.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the foregoing is a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed 12 August 2005, and it is submitted that claims 1 and 3 - 20 are in condition for allowance.

Should it be determined that an additional fee is due under 37 CFR §§1.16 or 1.17, or any excess fee has been received, please charge that fee or credit the amount of overcharge to deposit account #02-2666.

If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities which can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, a telephone call to the undersigned at (202) 607-4607 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/James S. Finn/
James S. Finn
Reg. No. 38450

Dated: 11/8/05

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd., Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 264-0967